REMARKS

Claims 1-39, as amended, remain herein.

Applicants appreciate the statements in the Office Action that claims 7-9, 17, 36, 38 and 39 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the independent claim(s) from which they depend.

Minor, editorial changes have been made in claims 1-8, 10-15, 17-32, 34, 36-38 have been amended to recite more clearly applicants' invention.

1. Claims 1-37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Claims 1, 23, 29 and 38 have been amended to replace the term "counter electrode" with "common electrode." Claims 21 and 23 have been amended to recite "the centerline of the surface of a first electrode is located...for forming an electric flux line of an electric field formed between the first electrode and a second electrode," thereby mooting the rejection.

2. Claim 1 was rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over claims 1-7 of issued U.S. Patent 6,525,798. The assignee files a Terminal Disclaimer herewith, disclaiming the terminal part of the term of any patent granted on this application, which part would extend beyond the expiration date of U.S. Patent 6,525,798. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

3. Claims 1-6, 10-17, 18-35 and 37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Ohta U.S. Patent 6,208,399.

The presently claimed liquid crystal display panel comprises a pixel electrode and a common electrode wherein, of such electrodes, the electrode that is located adjacent to and parallel to one of the image signal lines or one of the scanning signal lines comprises an opaque conductor, and at least one of the other electrodes comprises a transparent conductor. This arrangement is nowhere disclosed or suggested in the cited reference.

Regarding the pixel electrode of applicants' claims 1-6, Ohta '399, column 9, lines 40-46, discloses the pixel electrode becomes transparent, and such pixel electrode provides a brighter display than an opaque pixel electrode. Regarding the presently claimed common electrode, Ohta '399, column 15, lines 13-16, discloses that common electrode has a transparent conductive film formed in the same step as the pixel electrode. Thus, Ohta '399 does not disclose or suggest the use of an opaque electrode, in contrast with the presently claimed invention, wherein an electrode adjacent to an image signal line or a scanning signal line comprises an opaque conductor and other electrodes are selectively made transparent, i.e., at least one of the other electrodes comprises a transparent conductor, as recited in applicants' claim 1.

Regarding claims 21 and 23, Ohta '399 does not disclose or suggest any structure corresponding to applicants' centerline of the surface of a first electrode that is located adjacent to and parallel to one of the image signal lines or one of the scanning signal lines, for forming an electric flux line of an electric field formed between the first electrode and a second electrode

adjacent thereto, such flux line inclined toward the adjacent second electrode with respect to the direction of the normal of the array substrate, as recited in applicants' claim 23.

Claims 22 and 24 recite the upper surface of the first electrode that is located adjacent to and parallel to one of the image signal lines or one of the scanning signal lines is inclined toward the adjacent second electrode. Ohta '399, Fig. 1, shows the common electrode CT having an inclined surface.

However, applicants' claim 24, as shown in applicants' Fig. 8, comprises such electrode located adjacent to the image signal line on the array substrate. Therefore, the common electrode CT covering image signal line DL shown in Ohata '366, Fig. 2, does not correspond to applicants' first electrode recited in claim 24.

Claim 25 recites a first electrode that is structurally different from common electrode CT covering image signal line DL.

Regarding claims 10-15 and 29, the Office Action alleges that Ohta '399, Fig. 1, discloses light shielding member BM covering a region between the image signal line DL and common

electrode CT located adjacent to and parallel to image signal line DL. Actually, in Ohta '399, common electrode CT covers image signal line DL. However, applicants' claim 29, reciting the structure shown in applicants' Fig. 12, is not designed for the case where image signal line DL and common electrode CT are located so that one covers the other, but instead, signal lines 5 (parallel to pixel lines) are adjacent to common lines 1a, as claimed.

Regarding claims 2, 3, 4 and 6, Ohta '399, column 9, lines 27-35 and Fig. 2 disclose common electrode CT completely covering image signal line DL, as seen in Fig. 2. Ohta '399 discloses drain electrodes SD 2 that are overlapping, not the pixel electrode of the common electrode as in applicants' claims 2 and 3.

Regarding claims 16, 34 and 35 (corresponding to applicants' Fig. 11a), the Office Action alleges that Ohta '399 discloses a gap between light shielding member BM located on the counter electrode and scan line GL. Actually, the light shielding member of claims 16, 34 and 35 has a different construction in that the member is located on the array

substrate (for claim 16, see its parent claim 12, and for claims 34 and 35, see their parent claim 31).

Regarding claim 18, the Office Action suggests that Ohta '399 discloses light shielding member BM covering a region between common electrode CT and drain electrode SD. However, in applicants' claim 18, such electrode is the common electrode or the pixel electrode.

Claim 20 recites the common electrode located on the array substrate and the counter electrode. Ohta '399 discloses locating common electrode CT only on the array substrate, not on the array substrate and the counter electrode.

Regarding claim 37, Ohta '399 does not disclose or suggest a light shielding member covering a region between a pair of electrodes adjacent to each other with the image signal line or the scanning line located therebetween.

For the foregoing reasons, Ohta '399 does not contain any teaching, suggestion, reason, motivation or incentive that would have led one of ordinary skill in the art to applicants' claimed invention. Nor is there any disclosure or teaching in Ohta '399 that would have suggested the desirability of modifying any

portions thereof to anticipate or suggest applicants' presently claimed invention. Claims 2-6, 10-17, and 18-22, which depend from claim 1, are allowable for the same reasons described herein for claim 1. Claims 24-28, which depend from claim 23, are allowable for the same reasons described herein for claim 23, and claims 30-35 and 37, which depend from claim 29, are allowable for the same reasons described herein for claim 29. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

All claims 1-39 are now proper in form and patentably distinguished over all grounds of rejection cited in the Office Action. Accordingly, allowance of all claims 1-39 is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner deem that any further action by the applicants would be desirable to place this application in even better condition for issue, the Examiner is requested to telephone applicants' undersigned representatives.

Respectfully submitted,

PARKHURST & WENDEL, L.L.P.

December 22, 2003
Date

Roger W. Parkhurst
Registration No. 25,177
Robert N. Wieland
Registration No. 40,225

RWP:RNW/mhs

Attachments: Terminal Disclaimer
Check No. 17202 for $110

Attorney Docket No.: OGOH:103

PARKHURST & WENDEL, L.L.P.
1421 Prince Street, Suite 210
Alexandria, Virginia 22314-2805
Telephone: (703) 739-0220